

My question: Did you ~~would~~ welcome R shift to your
policy? Would you welcome Chinese shift to your position.
(Might be disagree with my hope R would self
back - (and Pak): "Yes." "Our formula is best basis for
consumers" [with China?] (OK?)

Group: Unilateral states should declare themselves - they can't go now -
one without acknowledging that they are nuclear [? or reverse?] Other would
CTB outweighs importance of safety Treaty - can I will

1000-1500 wars and can beyond

They say, "Why can't you go further?"
We don't think you will have that reaction;
they will find this all very hard.

[How is def. best resort, US leadership?
US had Russia away from NEU due -;
do you want this good? (Did this article
contribute? Would they have wished it to?/
would they like China to do so?

Why \$30B/yr on war structure with no answer every
(are!)?

(Many should be spent to reduce war danger East of
enduring threats)...

on de-targeting: Crowd: We have built very
complex to achieve our control

break Gordon: How would you explain to Ukraine
why US should treat "this" much differently from Israel's -

to me:
Drill: Bush says "A global NP regime is more important
than safety testing." How a CTB contributes to that is a question.
and a CTB is more important than monitoring: [that is book!]
monitoring can not go...

Clinton is doing better.
McC: I took a year to tell the American people there was no missile gap.